Remarks

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11, 14, 19-22, 30-41, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,742,143 to Kaler, et al. ("Kaler") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20020083217 to Ward, et al. ("Ward"). The Examiner also rejected claims 10, 12-13, 23-26, 27-29, 42, and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. The Examiner also rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler.

In this Response, Applicants have not added, canceled, or amended any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-45 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Claims 1-9

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claims 2-9 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method. For an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, the method creates an event object that occupies a memory space which is independent of the application. The method logs within the event object a start time, end time, and information regarding the event. The creating and the logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not make claim 1 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. *First*, neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest a method that performs event object creation and logging on a single computer on which an application executes. In the Office Action, the Examiner cited column 4, lines 9-13, and column 12, lines 1-11, of Kaler as disclosing the creation and logging on a single computer. *See* Office Action, page 14. The Examiner further stated that although the event is transmitted later to other

computer for analysis, the claim only recites '"creating and logging", and Kaler teaches the limitations.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Kaler discloses the creation and logging on a single computer on which an application executes. Instead, *Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of what Kaler refers to as "events" and logging are performed on different computers*. Applicants respectfully submit that event logging for a distributed computing system is fundamentally different from event logging on a single computer, as claimed in claim 1. Specifically, the cited sections describe an in-process event creator ("IEC") that monitors an execution process for particular occurrences (i.e., "events") and, when these "events" occur, store them in a memory buffer for logging. Kaler further describes that a *local event concentrator ("LEC") transiently and temporality retains the occurrence of these "events" in the "circular" memory buffer for logging*. However, these retained occurrences are written over when the memory buffer exceeds a specified limit. *See* Kaler, column 22, lines 17-22. In other words, the retained occurrences in the circular memory are erased without ever being logged.

Instead of logging on one computer on which an application executes, Kaler describes a VSA that performs the logging on another computer. *See Id.*, column 11, lines 23-34. Specifically, Kaler states that when a user's specified trigger condition is detected, the *LEC transmits all of the buffered events to the VSA for logging*. *See Id.*, column 22, lines 23-25. Hence, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of these occurrences and logging are performed on different computers, and not on one computer on which an application executes.

Second, neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest a method that creates an event object for an event, and logs within the event object a start time, end time, and information

regarding an event. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Kaler discloses "predefined fields" and "custom fields", and "time" is one the "pre-defined fields". The Examiner further stated that Ward teaches "time start", "time middle", and "time end"; and it would be obvious to combine Kaler with Ward. *See* Office Action, page 14.

Applicants respectfully disagree. It would not be obvious to combine Kaler with Ward because *Kaler would have no use for both a start time and an end time*. Specifically, the "events" that are disclosed in Kaler are not one event object that has logged within it a start and end time. Instead, the Kaler's "events" are a number of different occurrences when a specified condition is met. The "time" that Kaler describes (and which the Examiner pointed to in the Office Action) refers to a particular instance in time when the occurrence happened (i.e. "this thing happened"). One example of this is clearly illustrated in Kaler's "event log window" that lists several "events" each with only one corresponding time. *See e.g.,* Kaler, Figure 19, window 554. Thus, Kaler would have no use for both a start time and end time when each particular "event" of Kaler occurs at only one particular instance in time. Therefore, as Kaler would have no use for both a start time and end time, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-9 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9.

II. Claims 10-18

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. Claims 11-18 depend directly or indirectly on claim 10. Claim 10 recites a computer

that includes a computer readable storage. The computer readable storage stores a foundational layer upon which applications are built or executed. The computer readable storage stores an event logging mechanism created by the foundational layer. The event logging mechanism executes independently of the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of events and for generating an event log for any of the applications, without referencing any event logs of the applications. Each of the events is designated an enabled/disabled status and a disabled status disables all logging for an event.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not anticipate claim 10 for at least the following reasons. For instance, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism that is created by a foundational layer and executes independently of the applications. Instead, Kaler describes an IEC that monitors the execution process for particular occurrences (i.e., "events") in a data processing system. As described by Kaler, *the IEC resides in the process space of applications that it is monitoring* and reporting on. *See* e.g., Figure 3 which shows the IEC in the process of the Applications. Kaler makes it even clearer that *the IEC does not execute independently of the applications* because he describes that the IEC remains dormant in the process space of the applications until it is turned on. *See*, column 12, lines 33-45. Thus, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism that executes independently of the application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kaler does not render claim 10 unpatentable. As claims 11-18 are dependent on claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-18 are patentable over Kaler for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 10. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-18.

III. Claims 19 and 20

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claim 20 is dependent on claim 19. Claim 19 recites an article that includes a computer readable medium. The computer readable medium stores a computer program for execution by at least one processor. The computer program includes a set of instruction that when executed causes the following for each event in several events to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application. The execution of the set of instructions creates an event object. The event object occupies a memory space that is independent of the application. The execution of the set of instructions logs within the event object the start time, end time and information regarding the event. The creating and logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not make claim 19 unpatentable. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under the same rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above for claim 1, Applications respectfully submit that neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest performing event object creation and logging on a single computer, where the start time, end time, and information regarding the event are logged within the event object. Also, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these two references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 19 unpatentable. As claim 20 is dependent on claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 19. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19 and 20.

IV. Claims 21 and 22

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claim 22 is dependent on claim 21. Claim 21 recites an apparatus. The apparatus includes means for creating an event object for an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application. The event object occupies a memory space that is independent of the application. The apparatus includes means for logging within the event object the start time, end time, and information regarding the event. The creating and the logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not make claim 21 unpatentable. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under the same rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above for claim 1, Applications respectfully submit that neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest performing event object creation and logging on a single computer, where the start time, end time, and information regarding the event are logged within the event object. Also, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these two references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 21 unpatentable. As claim 22 is dependent on claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 20. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21 and 22.

V. Claims 23-29

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 23 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. Claims 24-29 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 23. Claim 23 recites a computer that includes a computer readable storage. The computer readable storage is for storing

a foundational layer upon which applications are executed. The computer readable storage is for storing a first application for executing on said foundational layer. The computer readable storage is for storing a second application for executing on the foundational layer. The computer readable storage is for storing an event-logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer, for functioning interoperably with but separately from the first and second applications, and for generating an event log for each of the first and second applications. At least one of the first and second applications does not generate an event log. The event-logging mechanism is separate from the first and second applications and is not compiled with the applications. The event logging mechanism creates an event object for each of the events. Each event object is designated for log information to be stored and later accessed for analysis.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not anticipate claim 23 for at least the following reasons. For instance, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism for functioning separately from applications. Instead, Kaler describes an IEC that monitors the execution process for particular occurrences (i.e., "events") in a data processing system. As described by Kaler, *the IEC resides in the process space of applications that it is monitoring* and reporting on. *See* e.g., Figure 3 which shows the IEC in the process of the Applications. Kaler makes it even clearer that *the IEC does not execute independently of the applications* because he describes that the IEC remains dormant in the process space of the applications until it is turned on. *See*, column 12, lines 33-45. Thus, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism for functioning separately from applications.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kaler does not render claim 23 unpatentable. As claims 24-29 are dependent on claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-29 are patentable over Kaler for at least the reasons that were discussed above in

relation to claim 23. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23-29.

VI. Claims 30-38

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claim 31-38 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 30. Claim 30 recites an event logging method. For each of several events that need to be logged but have not yet been logged within a plurality of applications, the method creates an event object. The method stores the event object in a first memory space that is uniquely allocated for the event logging method. The first memory space is separate from a second memory space allocated for the several applications. The method logs within the event object the start time, end time and information regarding the event. The first and second memory spaces are within a third memory space of a single computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not make claim 30 unpatentable. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 30 under the same rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above for claim 1, Applications respectfully submit that neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest performing event object creation and storing the event object in a first memory space that is within a second memory space of a single computer. Also, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these two references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 30 unpatentable. As claims 31-38 are dependent on claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-38 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed

above in relation to claim 30. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31-38.

VII. Claims 39-41

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 39 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claims 40 and 41 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 39. Claim 39 recites a method. For an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, the method creates an event object. The event object occupies a memory space a memory space that is independent of the application. The event object designated for log information to be stored and later accessed for analysis. The method logs within the event object a start time, end time and information regarding the event. The creating and the logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not make claim 30 unpatentable. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 30 under the same rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above for claim 1, Applications respectfully submit that neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest performing event object creation and storing the event object in a first memory space that is within a second memory space of a single computer. Also, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these two references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 30 unpatentable. As claims 31-38 are dependent on claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-38 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 30. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31-38.

VIII. Claims 39-41

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 39 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claims 40 and 41 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 39. Claim 39 recites a method. For an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, the method creates an event object. The event object occupies a memory space a memory space that is independent of the application. The event object designated for log information to be stored and later accessed for analysis. The method logs within the event object a start time, end time and information regarding the event. The creating and the logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not make claim 39 unpatentable. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 39 under the same rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above for claim 1, Applications respectfully submit that neither Kaler nor Ward disclose, teach, or even suggest performing event object creation and logging on a single computer, where the start time, end time, and information regarding the event are logged within the event object. Also, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these two references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 39 unpatentable. As claims 40 and 41 are dependent on claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 40 and 41 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 39. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39-41.

IX. Claims 42-45

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 42 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. Claims 43-45 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 42. Claim 42 recites a computer that includes a storage. The storage is for a foundational layer upon which applications are executed. The storage is for an event-logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer and for functioning interoperably with but separately from the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of events and generating an event log for each of said applications. At least one of the applications does not generate an event log. The event logging mechanism creates an event object for each of the events. Each event object designated for log information to be stored and later accessed for analysis.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not anticipate claim 42 for at least the following reasons. For instance, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism for functioning separately from applications. Instead, Kaler describes a IEC that monitors the execution process for particular occurrences (i.e., "events") in a data processing system. As described by Kaler, *the IEC resides in the process space of applications that it is monitoring* and reporting on. *See* e.g., Figure 3 which shows the IEC in the process of the Applications. Kaler makes it even clearer that *the IEC does not execute independently of the applications* because he describes that the IEC remains dormant in the process space of the applications until it is turned on. *See*, column 12, lines 33-45. Thus, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism for functioning separately from applications.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kaler does not render claim 42 unpatentable. As claims 43-45 are dependent on claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 43-45 are patentable over Kaler for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 42. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 43-45.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 1-45 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

ADELI & TOLLEN LLP

Dated: January 15, 2008

/Bum Pak/
Bum Pak
Reg. No. 56,916

Adeli & Tollen LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2514
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x305
Fax: (310) 785-9558